

REMARKS

This Reply is in response to the Office Action mailed on September 2, 2005 in which Claims 24-30 and 37 were objected to and in which Claims 1-13, 15-18, 20-23, 31-36, 38 and 39 were rejected. With this response, Claims 8, 18 and 33 are amended and Claim 34 is cancelled. Claims 1-13, 15-18 and 20-39 are presented for reconsideration and allowance.

I. Examiner Interview Summary.

On November 29, 2005, a telephonic interview was held between Examiner Wallerson and Applicants' attorney, Todd A. Rathe. The rejection of Claims 1, 11, 18, 21, 33 and 34 were discussed. It was tentatively agreed upon that Claims 1 and 11, without further amendment, are patentably distinct over Fujiwara, U.S. Patent No. 5,823,522, and Trask, U.S. Patent No. 5,116,034, since neither Fujiwara nor Trask disclose a holder having a lateral opening. It was also further tentatively agreed upon that Claims 18 and 33, as amended, overcome the rejections based upon Fujiwara and Trask or based upon Fujiwara since neither Fujiwara nor Trask disclose a method in which a printer having a media tray with a lateral media edge registration surface substantially parallel to a media input direction is provided and in which a media holder is positioned in the tray with media abutting the registration surface (Claim 18) or a media handling system having a wall that is movable towards an edge registration surface so as to move media laterally into contact with the edge registration surface (Claim 33). It was further tentatively agreed upon that neither Fujiwara nor Trask disclose a clamp that is resiliently biased towards an unclamped position (Claim 21).

Applicants wish to thank Examiner Wallerson for the opportunity to discuss the rejections and for Examiner Wallerson's suggestions for amending the claims to overcome the prior art of record.

II. Rejection of Claims 33, 34, 35, 36 and 38 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) Based Upon Fujiwara.

Paragraph 5 of the Office Action rejected Claims 33, 34, 35, 36 and 38 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Fujiwara, U.S. Patent No. 5,823,522. Claim 34 is cancelled. Claim 33, as amended, recites a media handling system having a tray with a media side edge registration surface and a holder having a wall configured to face the media edge registration surface while engaging edges of media and being movable toward edge registration surfaces to move media laterally into contact with the edge registration surface. Claims 35 and 36 depend from Claim 33. As noted above, during the Examiner interview, it was agreed upon that Fujiwara fails to disclose the limitations of Claim 33. Thus, Claims 35 and 36 overcome the rejection based upon Fujiwara for this additional reason.

C. Claim 38.

Claim 38 depends from Claim 33 and recites that the holder includes a clamp resiliently biased towards one of a clamped position and an unclamped position. In contrast, Fujiwara merely discloses a lever 4 which actuates a clip 3. Nowhere does Fujiwara disclose that clip 3 is resiliently biased. Accordingly, Claim 38 overcomes the rejection based on Fujiwara for this additional reason.

III. Rejection of Claims 1-13, 15-18, 20-23 and 31-32 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Based Upon Fujiwara and Trask.

Paragraph 7 of the Office Action rejected Claims 1-13, 15-18, 20-23 and 31-32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujiwara et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,823,522, in view of Trask et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,116,034. With this response, Claims 8 and 18 are amended. Claims 1-13, 15-18, 20-23 and 31-32, as amended, overcome the rejection based upon Fujiwara and Trask.

A. Claims 1 and 11.

Claim 1 recites a printer including a holder having a lateral opening configured for media in the receptacle of the holder to pass through the opening into contact with a registration surface of a media tray. Claim 11 recites a media holder which has a lateral opening configured to face a registration surface of a media tray so as to permit media in the receptacle of the holder to pass through the opening into contact with the registration surface. As noted above, during the Examiner interview held on November 29, 2005, it was tentatively agreed upon that neither Fujiwara nor Trask disclose the printer or the holder of Claims 1 and 11, respectively, since neither Fujiwara nor Trask disclose a holder having a lateral opening configured to permit media to pass through the opening into contact with the media edge registration surface. Thus, the rejection of Claims 1 and 11 based upon Fujiwara in view of Trask should be withdrawn. Claims 2-10 and Claims 12-17 depend from Claims 1 and 11, respectively, and are patentably distinct over Fujiwara and Trask for the same reasons.

B. Claims 7-9 and 15-17.

Claims 7 and 15 depend from Claims 1 and 11 and further recite that the holder includes an edge registration element such that media is laterally constrained by the holder edge registration element and the tray edge registration surface. Claims 8 and 16 depend from Claims 7 and 15 and further recite that the edge registration element is movable relative to the holder. Claims 9 and 17 depend from Claims 7 and 15, respectively, and further recite that the edge registration element is biased towards the tray edge registration surface. One example of the recited edge registration element is shown in Figure 2 (channeling member 30).

Neither Fujiwara nor Trask, alone or in combination, disclose a holder having an edge registration element that is movable relative to the holder or that is biased towards the tray edge registration surface. With respect to Claims 7, 8, 15 and 16, the Office Action refers to pick roller 26. However, pick roller 26 is clearly not part of

holder body 1. Thus, Claims 7-9 and 15-17 overcome the rejection based upon Fujiwara and Trask for these additional reasons.

C. Claim 18.

Claim 18 recites a method of printing which includes providing a printer having a media tray sized to receive a first size of media such that media is drawn from the tray in an input direction and having a lateral media edge registration surface substantially parallel to the input direction. The method further involves positioning in the tray a media holder containing small media of a second smaller size and abutting the small media against the registration surface. As noted above, during the Examiner interview held on November 29, 2005 it was tentatively agreed upon that neither Fujiwara nor Trask disclose the method recited in Claim 18. Accordingly, Claim 18, as amended, overcomes the rejection based upon Fujiwara and Trask. Claims 20-21 depend from Claim 18 and overcome the rejection for the same reasons.

D. Claim 21.

Claim 21 depends from Claim 1 and further recites that the printer includes a clamp movable between a clamped position and an unclamped position and wherein the clamp is resiliently biased towards the unclamped position. As noted above during the Examiner interview held on November 29, 2005, it was tentatively agreed upon that neither Fujiwara nor Trask disclose a clamp that is resiliently biased towards an unclamped position. In contrast, Fujiwara discloses a clip 3. Nowhere does Fujiwara disclose that clip 3 is resiliently biased towards an unclamped position. Thus, Claim 31 overcomes the rejection based upon Fujiwara and Trask for this additional reason.

E. Claim 31.

Claim 31 depends from Claim 1 and further recites that the printer forms an aperture into which the tray is inserted and that the holder is configured to be moved from a fully inserted to a completely removed position from the tray while the tray is

fully inserted into the aperture for printing operations. Neither Fujiwara nor Trask, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest a holder configured to be moved from a fully inserted to a completely removed position from the tray while the tray is fully inserted into the aperture of the printer for printing operations.

Neither Fujiwara nor Trask disclose such a printer. In contrast, holder 1 of Fujiwara is placed upon a hopper table 24 which is then inserted into upper cavity 22 of image reading apparatus 20. Once hopper table 24 is inserted into upper cavity 22 of image reading apparatus 20, holder 1 of Fujiwara cannot be moved from a fully inserted to a completely removed position all the while hopper table 24 is inserted in cavity 22. Accordingly, the rejection of Claim 31 is improper and should be withdrawn.

IV. Conclusion.

After amending the claims as set forth above, Claims 1-13, 15-18 and 20-39 are now pending in this application.

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 08-2025. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 08-2025. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

Respectfully submitted,

Date Dec. 1, 2005

By Todd A. Rathe

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22879
Telephone: (414) 297-5710
Facsimile: (414) 297-4900

Todd A. Rathe
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 38,276